

**REMARKS**

Claims 6-13 and 17-25 have been examined, and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner continues to reject the claims in view of the APA and Ota.

**I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-13 and 17-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The Examiner again maintains that the metes and bounds of the claims are not clear since it is unclear if a single cassette or a collection of cassettes is claimed.

*interview  
summary  
OK  
Sgt*  
The claims were discussed during the November 17, 2004 Examiner Interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor. The Examiner's Supervisor indicated that the body of the claims need to actually refer to the positioning pins of the recording and reproducing apparatus to tie the recording and reproducing apparatus of the preamble into the body of the claims. Accordingly, the claims have been amended in accordance with the discussions of the November 17, 2004 Examiner Interview.

Further, for the reasons set forth in the December 17, 2003 Amendment, Applicant submits that the claims are *not* indefinite. All tapes are recited in cooperation with a single recording and reproducing apparatus. Also, the fact that a claim is broad does not necessitate a rejection for indefiniteness reasons. In non-chemical arts, a claim may generally be written as